IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl.M. No.30961-M of 2007

Date of Decision: 21.5.2007

Ninderjit Kaur and another

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others.

...Respondents.

Present:- Mr.J.S.Gill,Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Chaudhary, AAG Haryana
for respondents No.1,3 and 5.

Mr. IPS Sidhu, Sr.DAG Punjab,
for respondents No.2,4 and 6.

****

S.S.SARON, J.(ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for seeking directions to respondents No.3 to 6 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners by providing them police protection and further directing the respondents No.3 to 6 not to interfere and not to let respondents No.7 and 8 or anybody else interfere with their liberty and lives or harass them in any manner.

The petitioners No.1 & 2 it is stated are major and they have solemnised their marriage among themselves. The said marriage is against the wishes of respondents No.7 and 8 who are the father and mother respectively of petitioner No.1 and therefore they have been threatening them. It is submitted that since 27.2.2007 respondents No.7 and 8 i.e. the

parents of petitioner No.1 in connivance with respondents No.3 to 6 are continuously threatening the petitioners. Therefore, they seek protection of their life and liberty.

On the last date of hearing i.e. 17.5.2007 copy of the petition was given to Mr. IPS Sidhu, Sr. DAG Punjab and also to Mr. Vikas Chaudhary, AAG Haryana, so as to enable them to seek instructions from their respective States.

Mr. IPS Sidhu, Sr.DAG Punjab, states that on 1.3.2007 Sukhdeep Singh brother of petitioner No.1 got registered a DDR at P.S. Kot Fata, District Bathinda, to the effect that Inderjit Singh, petitioner No.2, has forcibly taken Ninderjit Kaur, petitioner No.1.

Mr. Vikas Chaudhary, AAG Haryana, submits that there is no complaint of any kind with respondents No.1,3, and 5.

The petitioners are present in Court. Mr. J.S.Gill, learned counsel on instructions from them has submitted that the petitioners are happily married. They solemnised their marriage on 27.2.2007. However, being an inter-caste marriage it is not to the liking of respondents No.7 and 8. Therefore, their life and liberty is liable to be protected.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record it may appropriately to be noticed that the petitioners have not approached respondents No3 to 6 setting out their grievances as have been made in the present petition. The said respondents No.3 to 6 would be in a better position to ascertain the ground reality and in the facts and circumstances of the case also grant the necessary relief.

In view of the afore-said position, the criminal miscellaneous is

disposed of with the direction that in case the petitioners approach respondents No.3 to 6 setting out their grievances as have been made in the present petition, the same would be looked into by them independently and in accordance with law.

(S.S.SARON)
JUDGE

May 21,2007
Reema